

**From:** [ANDERSON Jim M](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [MCCLINCY Matt](#)  
**Subject:** Reviewing RD2 SCSR  
**Date:** 02/12/2007 08:49 AM

---

Eric & Chip,

At the end of the RD2 Data Retreat, we said we'd develop a strategy for reviewing the report & share it during our 2/14 TCT mtg. I looked at report outline (Val O's 1/19/07 e-mail) & re-looked at EPA's 12/2/05 "Identification of RD3 Data Gaps" letter & EPA's 2/17/06 "RD 3 Scope of Work" letter.

As you guys said, we'll need to be smart about this review. We'll need to focus on identifying data gaps. Since hardly anyone will be able to review the entire report (except maybe you 2..., good luck with that one), we should also consider dividing the report & assign sections or tasks to individuals.

I like the way EPA/partners have broken in to work groups in the past. I suggest we consider re-forming those work groups for the RD2 SCSR review as follows:

Physical/N&E WG- EPA (Rene, Curt, Kristine, PMX, Eric, & Chip), DEQ (Jim, Matt, & Tom G), Partners (Tribes & NOAA)

Eco Risk Assessors- EPA (Burt, Joe, Eric & PMX), DEQ (Jennifer), Partners (Tribes, Jeremy, NOAA)

HH Risk Assessors- EPA (Dana, Eric, & PMX), DEQ (Mike P), partners (Tribes & NOAA)

I suggest we consider breaking the RD2 SCSR review into the following assignments:

- 1.0 Introduction- Quick review by everyone
- 2.0 Sources of Environmental Data- Quick review by PMX &/or Gina
- 3.0 CSM Summary- Quick review by everyone
- 4.0 Physical Setting- Quick reviews by:
  - 4.1 Land Use- Physical/N&E WG & SC staff (Jim, Matt, Kristine)
  - 4.2 Hydrogeology- Physical/N&E WG
  - 4.3 Hydrology- Physical/N&E WG
  - 4.4 Riverbed Characteristics & Sediment Dynamics- Physical/N&E WG & EPA hydro modelers
  - 4.5 Sediment Transport Regimes- Physical/N&E WG & EPA hydro modelers
  - 4.6 Habitat- Eco Risk Assessors
  - 4.7 Human Access & Use- HH Risk Assessors
- 5.0 Identification of Sources- Physical/N&E WG
- 6.0 In-River Chemical Distribution- Quick review by everyone
- 7.0 Overview & Approach to Assessment of Loading, Fate, & Transport Processes- Physical/N&E WG & EPA hydro modelers
- 8.0 Initial HH Risk Evaluation Summary- HH Risk Assessors
- 9.0 Initial Eco Risk Evaluation Summary- Eco Risk Assessors
- 10.0 Preliminary Identification of iAOPCs- Everyone
- 11.0 CSM- Everyone
- 12.0 Data Gaps & Additional Data Needs- Everyone

I think we also need to see how well the RD2 SCSR addresses issues contained in EPA's 12/2/05 & 2/17/06 letters. Here's my suggestion for that task:

Does the RD2 SCSR or the RD 3A work address the data gaps EPA identified in their 12/2/05 letter?  
Mainly EPA/PMX, with support by appropriate WGs

Does the RD2 SCSR or the RD 3A work address the data needs EPA identified in their 2/17/06 letter?  
Mainly EPA/PMX, with support by appropriate WGs

I also think it would be worthwhile for someone (PMX) to go thru EPA's 2 letter & summarize the data gaps & SOW in concise tables to help us manage this effort. I'd like to see this summary several days before 2/21 so we have a chance to review & understand.

This is all just a suggestion to start the ball rolling.

James M. Anderson  
DEQ Northwest Region  
Portland Harbor Section  
Phone (503) 229-6825  
Fax (503) 229-6899